Institutionalised Pseudo-Justice: How it affects CSA and pedophilia in its compounding (ontop of feminism, protectionism, and puritanism.)

In preambulating I use a political example in highlighting a symptom surely, and shortly recognised: "Although a generalisation, a perceived aspect of the left is cancel-culture, a proclivity to respond to 'touchy' subjects with emotion, outrage and smearing in trying to shut down discussion which would challenge their views. Some might separate censorship from this sullying but the isms, ists, phobics are a means to that end; the language is vitriolic, is malicious and some might describe it as authoritarianism, an idea to which people forget the applications of moral subjectivism, extremely, and, you can see it now, we have moralists who wish to crush the bad guys, and not in a peaceful or respectful way. (Right side of history)"

This symptom is surely recognised.
So what of the disease itself?

By multiple means—cognitive biases, in-group favouritism, evolutionary purposes, social intuitionism—humans possess a proclivity to disparage persons, or a people on a basis of dislike. In today's culture, the mechanism by which this culminates into a demonisation has been facilitated to the point it's safe to describe as institutionalised:

1. Disparagement: Where initial negative judgments are formed based on biases, prejudices, or misinformation.

-Haidt 2001: Social intuitionism—strong, initial moral reaction based on a moral dumbfounding
-Jones & Harris, 1967 and Fundamental Attribution Error, where people tend to attribute negative actions or characteristics to the individual's nature rather than situational factors. This step involves initial judgments that emphasise negative aspects.
-Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979): In-group favouritism leads to the out-group being judged negatively. Initial disparagement arises from perceiving the out-group as different, inferior.

- Dehumanisation: The negative judgments may *(not always)* lead to perceiving the person or group as less than human—stripping them of individuality and moral consideration.

-Haslam's dehumanisation model
-Kurzban & Leary (2001): Stigmatisation, social exclusion as forms of dehumanisation makes it easier to treat others cruelly.

2. Demonisation: Finally, the person or groups' status as less-than-human, or simply morally inferior, facilitates the viewing of them as harmful, evil, which 'justifies' hostile or aggressive actions against them.

-Baumeister et al. (2001): The focus on negative traits and actions leads to seeing these individuals or groups as evil or dangerous.
-Moral Disengagement (Bandura, Underwood, & Fromson, 1975): This involves justifying punitive actions against the dehumanised/ disparaged group by believing they deserve such treatment due to a supposed malevolence.

Of moralist miasma, this is the emotion, disparagement, dehumanisation, *demonisation* process (EDDD) from which a pervasive and punitive pseudo-justice arose and found itself conflated with *(rational)* justice to the unknowing of those too unknowingly emotion-driven to recognise it as the danger it's always proved throughout history. The goal of this mini-essay is demonstrate the institutionalisation of this process, how it led to a pseudo-justice, and to summarise the vicious cycle *(reciprocal cause & effect)* between culture and human nature which continues to worsen it beyond levels of "savage" societies, in that the mechanism by which this occurs is happening more discreetly—harder to recognise—and is just as dangerous *(which makes it more dangerous):* Third-World Lynch-Mobs = Pedophile Hate-Mobs

Notes:
-First and foremost, I'm not claiming this is to be the sole cause for issues I will mention. I'm merely pointing to the phenomenon as a consistent factor in a lot of issues, which, from what I've seen, only aggravates and makes them more difficult. I've noted six main contributors for pedophobia, but I highlight three in particular for their prevalence in many other topics, which allows me to make comparisons.
-I mainly refer to "grooming", CP consumption, and statutory rape. Actual, forceful, penetrative, rape can be lumped in with other severe crime which are barely affected by any alleviation of EDDD, because they're horrible in and of themselves—not by some societally inflated severity, but does the distinction matter? "HOW can you say willing adult-child sex is okay when I was forced to blow my uncle when I was 5!?!" I glossed over the importance of willingness in my quora answers, but I want to hammer down further how ludicrously bad the science is which 'proves' sex is inherently harmful to children. I pointed out FE as one of the glaring confounds not controlled for, but there are CSA studies which don't even bother seperating willing and unwilling encounters, and it's these asinine studies from which the 'well known' CSA-adjustment link arose. If we used the same methodology for adult-adult sex we'd also 'discover' a maladjustment link for that. Truthfully, I really can't stress enough how terrible the science is. Imagine assessing rape victims and otherwise healthy sexually active adults who are beaten by their spouses daily, not controlling for the rape and domestic abuse, and then coming to the conclusion all adult-adult sex is inherently harmful, then you treat all adults who've had sex as horrifically abused and traumatised, creating a self-fulfulling, never-ending cycle of iatrogenic harm via treatment, as the harm unknowingly caused by treatment only affirms the need for the treatment in the first place, and then we go around, and around, and around. That's a parallel to what's happening with CSA, and I'm not joking. In terms of everything, child-adult sex doesn't differ from adult-adult sex. "B-b-but it is harmful!" I'm going to tell you to research it yourself, the same way you tell other people to further research WWII, The

Holocaust, 9/11; Sandy Hook, JFK's Assassination, The Great Replacement; Vaccines, Jews, Big Pharma; Ethnic Crime Overrepresentation, Systemic Racism, Rich Tax Evasion; The Holodomor, the Goods of Communism, in finding a "hidden, or non-mainstream truth". I will delve into scepticism later.
-In being consistent, I'm obviously open minded. Throw my way any reasons to be sceptical concerning inherent natures of murder or rape.
-I obviously don't believe EDDD should play any role in any trial or delivering of justice - Bastian, Denson Haslam 2013; processes should be face-to-face, calm, and rational.
-It's apparent this isn't profound knowledge only I claim to possess, as a lot is rudimentary and has been well accepted by many lay persons and professionals for centuries. What I do claim is an interesting perspective through pedophilia which should highlight its prominence outside politics and in how democracy fails.
-When I mention EDDD, know moralism or essences of moral superiority is always implied.
(These three processes are not requisites in enabling each other, but merely facilitators. Dehumanisation is not necessary for potential demonisation from disparagement)

* * *

"A civilisation evolves upwards, in that each segment of civilisation becomes more civilised, less barbaric in some ways. It's supposed to—not that it necessarily does. Sometimes it seems to appear to be more civilised when in fact it becomes more barbaric, more quick to condemn the rest of the world, more quick to kill the rest of the world that does not think as it thinks" - Marshall Applewhite - 1996
*In other words: How dare you stand against our clearly superior morals and civility. That obviously means you're inherently *more* bad to stand against us now than if you were to stand against us a decade ago, or the decades before that! Can't you see we're on the path to attaining an absolute good? Who are you to impede on that?*
I imagine there was no hesitation on behalf of Christian missionaries in their cleansing of the cultures of Polynesia and the Sambia.

In opening, I posit 'Emotion over Logic' as a natural human tendency: *Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow; Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2000); LeDoux, J. E. (2000); Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979); Haidt, J. (2001); Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003); Bechara, A., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. R. (2000); Loewenstein, G., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001)* A tendency greatly used and abused in the culture. Where rationality should lead, emotion thrives instead; emotion intermingled with the triple D's *(fast cognitive response - Dual Process theory)* which only propels the viewing of opposition as being simply disagreeable to bad, malicious (*Haidt 2001).* The main issue, here, lies in people not resisting this phenomenon to the point they fail to recognise when they fall victim to it—in they think perhaps it's permissible, or good in their scenarios—which becomes hazardous in numerous contexts *(most notably justice),* and which brings me to the point of this not only being an especially dangerous vicious cycle, but an unbeatable one, an EDDD culture no different than any other past civilisation *(Civility is not a remedy - Failure by human nature).* This is evident in the culture of smearing, and condemnation of pedophilia wherein the very same EDDD mechanism exists but is not recognised as an issue, as it's thought our civilized societies are generally advanced to the stage we are now safely 'correcter' on a number of—high-emotion—subjects that in some ways, 'already have been concluded': Childhood sexuality, 'Superior' western morality, mainly—but lesser so: Gun control; Refugee resettlement; Western intervention; Feminism waves; Current Holocaust narrative *(conspiracy theories - although I highly disagree with him, the Alex Jones trial pissed me off, and so do the slamming down of narrative questionings); (EDDD, moralising, a "righteousness" heavily utilised in the faux-resolutions or surviving of these subjects—that these are non-existent, or inherently good or true)* thus, creating the illusion, for some, the behaviour now only affects trivial discussions: petty discourse, cancel-culture; toxicity, people I don't like *(exes, colleagues, classmates).* Clearly, the fiery premises from which the discussions on the former list arose are just as valid now as they were decades ago; due to their axioms being reached through *(too much)* fervid emotion, a moralising and a disparagement, demonisation of other people, they still suffer from the most fierce debate, and today, now, you can observe false, flimsy, axioms which accept the conclusions open-armed. For example: the 'truth' that gun bans dramatically decrease gun violence was, pretty much, built off people screeching as far back as 1997; the same as systemic racism in the police; systemic oppression against modern women; and everything else postmodern feminism contrives; you get my point. This is why smearing, dishonesty, and lack of engagement are that much more prevalent. "What do you mean there are net-negative consequences to my beliefs, or they could be entirely wrong? I clearly have a leg to stand on. My beliefs have been widely, positively established for a reason!".
What I am ultimately pointing to is a pervasiveness of EDDD, a link between pedophilia and every other subject where fervid emotion is about on any given side. Pedophilia has about it centuple the emotions and all three of the D's—there's no question about that. These components, however, to me, are pervasive, and prevalent in many other ideas, and many of those positions—*"ban evil guns!","LGBT are groomers!"* are viewed as detestable, questionable, yet there's an exception or ignorance of this wariness towards conclusions when it concerns pedophilia, and I ascribe this happening to six things, although, for this essay I focus mainly on three in particular as they can be more widely applied to issues with their general, more pervasive nature:

- Protectionist motives: Given how children are the most vulnerable members of society, it's sensical a large portion of the upholding of the childhood sexuality and CSA narratives is done to protect from the widely known intrinsic harm of sex, but with respect to scepticism and what we know about protectionism as a justification for past moral panics—*satanic and ritual abuse; razor blades in candy; abductor pedophiles*—I don't buy this motive as something which gives current pedophilia attitudes a pass; I believe there are enticing aspects to the position even outside protectionism, religion, and control. With respect to this, you can read the introduction of Stephen Kershnar's book

"Pedophilia and Adult–Child Sex: A Philosophical Analysis" which delves a bit further into why we should be sceptical with regards to children's sexuality, as, generally, with being mindful of everything we were wrong on about children in the past, it makes zero sense to now turn around and proclaim "Okay, now we're definitely correct on what we know about children this time!". I imagine we say that because, again, we've "progressed generally with respect to morality and science" which somehow means, by default, we should be 'more' correct or closer to reaching the truth on children, which is a pretty funny belief when you consider how America in the 50s and 60s was building hydrogen bombs and making moon trips whilst tussling over whether or not boys kissing boys induces psychopathology. Anyways, the book is an interesting read. This essay mainly focuses on the average person and the knowledge they receive so I can more reliably apply to the general population, EDDD, moral superiority, pseudo-justice.

- Control: Sex taboos provide control, and the children should be controlled.
- Religion: Self explanatory

What I believe to be the pervasive factors:

1. **A potential to be as emotional as you want, disparaging, dehumanising, and demonising others with moral impunity—a comfortable position; it's something we've all taken part in at least once, and it does feel good.**

2. **Moral superiority with its potential for moral outrage and justice-**

3. **Punitive, feel-good pseudo-justice full of overriding emotion and lacking rationality.**

A flaw of this perhaps pointable to is: "But plenty of ideas involve EDDD, and surely you don't question them! Look at unjust murder; you know that's wrong" First off, I don't "know" unjust murder is wrong, and second, I am merely saying EDDD is something to be cautious of due its role in aggravating discussions/situations, and inflating horrible ideas through alluring feel-good emotional, and moral pedestals from which to enact a pseudo-justice—*justice arising from sizzling emotions, outrage, and DDD.* The issue, here, lies in people becoming less apt at realising its danger the further up the ladder we go. As follows: Third-world lynch-mobs love EDDD'ing petty thieves. Westerners love EDDD'ing political opposition. Everyone loves EDDD'ing pedophilies, but here it's suddenly, unquestionably a good thing. There's reasoning, enticing pretences involved in all three of these, and so, again, I'm simply saying to be sceptical when EDDD is involved, or is the brunt of what you see, at least: when anti-mass immigration partisans are called racist; when pedophiles are called invariable inhuman monsters. In scenarios where EDDD has worked its dark magic, there will be infinitely more splotches of dubiety from which to start a scepticism and this is evidenced in the aforementioned subjects; for each one listed, you should be capable of vividly picturing the expected cohorts of seething cacodemons, smearing and tearing up and down—racist! groomer! monster!—and I know this because you should be recalling from memory. Allow me to expand on EDDD, now; for this I'll mention abortion in bringing up how the pro-choice side, despite intense afflictions from EDDD, does have genuine merit, or more than most ideas with that affliction; this merit, however, is tarnished by the lack of discussion, the outrage, the postmodern feminism which arises from the EDDD, leading me to believe there's no safe way to ignorantly persist with it—*it must be realised at the pedophilia level*—as, to my knowledge, there's zero net-benefits, zero true fruitful reason to succumb to it outside instant gratification. If there are, you're likely looking at a situation which fed into your immediate reward systems; harsh, punitive measures against the man who stole my front porch!—why bring up this in particular? could a fitting verdict not be reached via calm, rational means *(Bastian, Denson Haslam 2013)*? When has any of its proponents helped? our propensity to demonise others helped? People have even partly recognised this at the extreme instance and are pushing to destigmatise pedophilia as, with respect to that whole axiom, stigmatisation does nothing to prevent CSA, and I do partly owe people respect for that.
(*overriding)* Emotion, disparagement, dehumanisation, and demonisation. Once EDDD has been fully realised, I point to becoming accustomed to rational approaches to efficiently combat it, as the human processes from which EDDD arises—*cognitive biases, in-group favouritism, evolutionary purposes, social intuitionism*—play a large role in peoples' condemnations of the paraphilias I am to discuss. I really, really do not wish to sound pompous or pretentious—with this being 9th-grade stoner level philosophy—but it is true more rationality and less overriding of emotions would stop the making of societies less ideologically heterogeneous, less polarising, divisive than they healthily need be *(ideological diversity is, of course, necessary)*—this, of course, is considering differing historical, cultural contexts and perspectives. This is evident—clearly—but I don't seek merely pointing it out, so know this: You must acknowledge the effects on the handling of every worldly problem if people were capable of rationally approaching, say, nepiophilia and the raping of newborn corpses *(regardless of validity of conclusions with respect to science and consequentialism, respectively—I factor in epistemic-bounded rationality).* If one could approach such a topic without a shred of overriding emotion, then would it not be easier for them to rationally approach anti-mass immigration partisans *(which they previously, vehemently smeared and opposed)?* Of course, I don't doubt the potential of emotion to healthily be a part of rational approaches, nor the importance of emotion in shaping ideas and ethical frameworks, but we're at a stage where some of the most widespread ideas are blatantly irrational—widespread, thanks to the critical role of what I'm discussing (EDDD).
Before we continue I'd like to clarify a few things. First of all: I am not calling anyone irrational. Secondly: I am not calling every position which opposes mine irrational or lacking rationality. And thirdly, and most importantly: I am only interested in rationality, the process by which conclusions are reached—not any particular position or idea; anyone could have a correct or rational idea yet still defend it by irrational means, including, of course, me.

If this essayed, nuanced, perspective is inaccurate then I'm fine with leaving it at "It's obvious there are irrational ideas which can be weeded out!" Pedophilia is simply a tool, as with antinatalism if it wasn't such a horrible, harmful idea to push (declining birth rates - mass immigration)

You have to wonder the percentage of people who complain about this yet succumb to their social intuitionism when I mention necrophilia, cannibalism, or incest—*let alone pedophilia and infant necrophilia*. I want to first explore epistemic-bounded rationality, a thing I can't give current pedophile attitudes a pass by with an emphasis on the slithering out of axioms in creating wrongfulness, villains where there are none, and the utter absence of healthy scepticism in the face of reasons for it to start. In regards to pedophilia and legality, if this bounded rationality were followed, for starters, we'd see a destigmatisation of the disorder; we'd encourage pedophiles to seek treatment and therapy; esearch more childsex dolls; 'ethical' child porn *(old, and agreed to by victim)* in controlled settings to perhaps decrease risks of offending, and we'd support their use of it if the research emerged they were beneficial, or neutral, for that matter. Furthermore, the scientific validity of legal definitions surrounding consent and sexual abuse would be *heavily* scrutinised: *"Should we really be calling the consensual sex between a 16-year-old boy and 21-year-old woman RAPE? Is there truly a VICTIM and ABUSER here? In terms of sexual abuse, this truly creates a heavy dent on the predictive utility and seriousness of those terms, doesn't it? We use those same terms for when toddlers are horrifically and violently penetrated by, say, their uncles".* In this nub I'll consider the lay person and what an epistemic-bounded rationality concerning CSA *should* resemble. The layperson—the Joe—they believe CSA is horrible, the sexuality of children is iffy, are aware of the great EDDD plaguing the topic yet see little wrong. Their position on consent likely aligns with the law or some vague definition of maturity, and they've likely had some personal experience with CSA via by themselves or someone they know. For the argument's sake, let's say this person supports destigmatisation and the aforementioned prevention treatments. Why, then, do I accuse this person of succumbing to EDDD? For the coming point I'll preambulate by perambulating about psychological iatrogenesis, with an example which further corroborates the dormant pervasiveness regarding the trend of conceding power to emotion, and moral outrage—(please say that ten times fast)—*which we do, and have actively encouraged, and which has allowed logically unstable ideas to flourish, institutions built on foundations of lies.* I paraphrase from a review of Bruce Rind on the congressional condemnation of his 1998 meta-analysis in a section regarding the satanic panic of the 1980s, where, across the USA, thousands of unsubstantiated instances of satanic ritual abuse would emerge and spark vast widespread moral panic. One infamous instance of this was the McMartin preschool case of 1983 to 1990, in California: Following the appearance of a rash or ambiguous remark made by one preschooler, full-scale police investigations would ignite of all the children at the centre. Initially, the children would deny any abuse occurred, but after incessant interrogation by therapists, and recovered-memory practitioners, they were gaslit into believing absolutely absurd things had been done to them: They spoke of being molested in tunnels, or magic rooms, sodomised with curling irons or swords; forced to consume faeces or drink the blood of sacrificed babies; made to watch animals being ritually tortured and killed, and this lead to convictions despite no evidence of these ever occurring. Children's initial denials were attributed to PTSD, wherein it was believed they failed to reveal the truth because of fear or amnesia. And it's not just they simply falsely recalled memories: studies examining the victims, Kelly (1993) reported half of the children also fell in the clinical range of traumatic stress following sexual abuse, meaning the stress responses were entirely iatrogenic, stemming from therapeutic and criminal justice intervention, as well as parental anxiety and panic—end quote. Although maybe not recognisable by its name, the layperson, with a factoring in of asymptomatic individuals and an incessant pushing of victimhood onto them, should recognise the dubious smell about the CSA narrative—*especially in regards to the discrepancy of the male 'CSA victim' purportedly suffering from long lasting effects equal to female CSA victims despite more positively responding to experiences*. EDDD might be resisted until CSA comes into the equation, at which time it is wholly, unequivocally embraced and enjoyed; the pseudo-justice will commence; it will satisfy the anger we *want* to consistently have, for without the surviving of this hatred, we will have no target where a condemnation and brutalisation of this scale goes without moral question; I wonder, if the concept of secondary victimisation was introduced to the parents of a willing CSA victim, would they reconsider their approach, or remain outraged in making the justice against the pedophile feel better?—*Jones et al 2005; Sandfort 1987; Hines, Finkelhor 2006.* I posit the average layperson is familiar with psychological iatrogenesis. If you believe additional harm can be caused to the victim ontop of CSA via the proceedings after the abuse—*overly extreme interrogation by relatives and professionals, court case revictimisation*—then yes, you're aware of iatrogenic harm; in being more thorough: look at aversion therapy, recovered-memory treatment, homosexuality in the 20th century, gay-conversion therapy with its causings of depression, anxiety, substance abuse, suicide, and a plethora of other familiar mental health issues. I'm not using this by itself in 'proving' there exists no CSA-adjustment link, as there turned out to be none with homosexuality, but what I am saying is this is a reason to launch a scepticism which is *mysteriously* not being engaged. Alongside iatrogenic effects there are other discrepancies which respect the basic knowledge the lay person receives regarding asymptomatic individuals from which they can easily start a scepticism, yet choose not to. Let's run it back: Someone may mention the disproportionate rate at which third-worlders commit sexual offences compared to non-third-worlders; they might grow curious as to the facts regardless of, or further than, the surface explanations like data distortion, socioeconomic factors, and marginalisation. Likewise, a boy is asymptomatic after adult-child sex; someone may grow curious regardless of the delayed trauma, misattribution explanation, or traumatised so horrifically they fail to register they've been abused, *(lol)* explanation, at which point the merits of these, and alternative explanations should mutually evaluated in reviewing the appropriate literatures; what ignites these scepticisms may simply be a found incredulity when the explanations are applied to certain phenomena; eg; lack of willingness to integrate from their silos, and disproportionately more positive testimonies of CSA experiences than females, respectively. Other dubieties concerning CSA include: inconsistent CSA symptoms, not reporting of experiences due to lack of perceived severity *(my nigger Osborne),* and the likely existence of well-adjusted pedophiles, even, and not the retards, sadists and psychopaths ludicrously thought as making up them. Despite there being the same, if not more points to start scepticism compared to other narratives—WWII, Holocaust—the points aren't investigated on the same scale. In scrutinising why people don't bother recognising this discrepancy, I simply could not accept any protectionist motive as an excuse.

I use this as both elicit strong protectionist motives: If people, mainly the left, cared about American children dying in school shootings and wanted preventative measures, then why not investigate their own positions and observe all the facts in coming to the best possible conclusion? You don't question the causality interpretability in your datas, the studies from which anti-gun statistics hail, you don't even ask if the USA is even comparable to the UK and Australia; instead, you groupthink, you demonise, shout, become outraged, moralise—this, to me, is not wanting to wholeheartedly prevent school shootings. Likewise, if a parent truly cared about mitigating the effects of CSA, then, again, why not investigate their own position and observe all the facts in coming to the best possible conclusion? There isn't even conversation as far as secondary victimisation, where it's still understood CSA is inherently harmful, but further harm may also come from repeated interrogation and overreaction. This is nonsensical to me. In both scenarios the goal is to protect children from perceived extreme dangers; why, then, in the latter, is rationality and scepticism thrown out the window entirely? Even when protectionist motives are heavily involved, why is one able to be faced rationally but the other not?—*I'm not necessarily saying rationality leads to the same conclusions as mine, but rather the ability to have the conversation as if it were any other topic.* To my knowledge there isn't a biological hardwiring against CSA in particular, only a general, possible, harm towards our children, and I don't believe most people are conscious about their desire to control children, so I won't pay it much attention, but does this leave me to highlight these three things which draws and retains people to the narrative outside of protectionism and control: EDDD; moral superiority; pseudo-justice—three things fostered during my subconscious likening of justice against pedophiles to that of third-world lynch mobs way back when I used to feel hatred for anti-pedophiles. Ultimately, this is to say, there are points at which an emotional, moralistic blindfold is adorned and not cared for, or at least acknowledged as the thorn it's consistently proved to act as in the past. I place this lack of mind for the blindfold on the feel good aspects allowed by it, which, by its denomination, should be self explanatory with regards to human nature: EDDD *(moralism - correctness); moral impunity in performing feel-good actions against others which would normally be thought of as wrong*. In, again, bringing up third-world lynch mobs, I'll elaborate as to flesh out pseudo-justice a little further: A Nigerian man steals a bundle of bananas; people become outraged; they hurl abuse at him; they shout over his voice, tear his clothes off, and dirty him, stripping him of his humanity; he is the bad guy, the villain, and we will deliver a sweet justice, sweet justice in satisfying and rewarding ourselves. I'll reiterate: There are plenty of glaring reasons to start scepticism concerning the CSA and childhood sexuality narrative—there's the same, if not higher incredulity regarding certain aspects. Outside of protectionist motives, why, then, is this not being questioned or approached on the same scale and way as other subjects?

- Because you're blinded by the importance of institutionalised control over children under the axiom—you cherish it and could never imagine challenging it; your child must remain totally yours.

1. Because you're blinded by the overriding emotion, disparaging, dehumanising and demonising permitted under the axiom.
2. Because you're blinded by the moral superiority and pseudo-justice permitted under the axiom—you're not fundamentally different from persecutor homophobic Christians and Witch-hunters.
3. Because you're blinded by the moral outrage and hatred allowed under the axiom. Answer me this: Which is more fun: group-hating black people for their high levels of criminality, or going further and investigating *why* that's the case?

My friendo, the anti-contact Joe, may succumb to EDDD again in a gross dehumanising of offending pedophiles despite obvious doubtfulness about the narrative, and despite EDDD in general possessing zero net benefit. I will light your mind in its swift and automatic making the application to offenders here; *Kelman, Herbert C. (1973): "To understand the processes of dehumanisation, we must first ask what it means to perceive another person as fully human, in the sense of being included in the moral compact that governs human relationships. I would propose that to perceive another as human we must accord him identity and community, concepts that closely resemble the two fundamental modalities of existence termed "agency" and "communion" by Bakan (1966). To accord a person identity is to perceive him as an individual, independent and distinguishable from others, capable of making choices, and entitled to live his own life on the basis of his own goals and values. To accord a person community is to perceive him-along with one's self-as part of an interconnected network of individuals who care for each other, who recognize each other's individuality, and who respect each other's rights. These two features together constitute the basis for individual worth for the acceptance of the individual as an end in himself, rather than a means toward some extraneous end. Individual worth, of necessity, has both a personal and a social referent; it implies that the individual has value and that he is valued by others."*
-Nick Haslam's Dehumanisation Review (2006)
I gesture mainly to animalistic dehumanisation, and the denying of HN, HU traits. Explaining how they apply, again, would be redundant. I'd like to point here where this relation to violence is further corroborated by Bandura, Albert (2002), where the ideas of *"moral justification, sanitising language and exonerative social comparison; disavowal of personal agency in the harm one causes by diffusion or displacement of responsibility; disregarding or minimising the injurious effects of one's actions; and attribution of blame to, and dehumanisation of those who are victimised"* are argued to make it easier for individuals to commit acts they would typically consider unethical.
"Let me tell you something about how these slime operate. Pedophilia is pathological narcissism let loose on the vulnerable; they live and they breathe, just to exploit the weak and needy. Psychiatrists will tell you these men are literal reptilians; their brain circuitry is so damaged, it "bypasses" the mammalian. While molesters might be able to play the "lover" role initially, this is recalled from reflexive memory, and it's a ruse. Children who have escaped the pedophile's clutches alive, will tell you the pedophile's lust is grasping, ravenous and destructive - an orgasmic violence beyond his own control." !!!! Compare offending pedophiles to, for example, serial killers, and you'll notice the patent steer from objective, more matter-of-fact, approaches towards whatever the hell I want them to be! Who cares!? What? Did you just state a fact about offending pedophiles without first calling them deleterious devil-born wood-chipper satan-dildo cum guppies? You got a soft spot for chomos, fucking chomo?

(The opening passage irks me so I have to say associations of pedophilia with pathology are based on studies involving forensic and clinical sampling—dumb or severe enough to be discovered. Again, synonymous with the "proving" of pathology in homosexuals via prison and insane asylum samples)

God, we can even see this at the professional level *(here I refer to moralism as separate from EDDD).* David Finkelhor, one of the fathers of the children's sexual victimology, himself acknowledged the validity of Rind's findings, saying CSA is primarily a moral issue, and yet continuing to work in his field in 'proving without a shadow of a doubt the harmfulness and pervasiveness of CSA' which isn't how science works; you don't set out to prove assumptions as that risks confirmation bias.

"Ultimately, I do continue to believe that the prohibition on adult-child sexual contact is primarily a moral issue. While empirical findings have some relevance they are not the final arbiter. (...) Some types of social relationships violate deeply held values and principles in our culture about equality and self-determination. Sex between adults and children is one of them. Evidence that certain children have positive experiences does not challenge these values, which have deep roots in our worldview."

You have to wonder why the CSA narrative is one he wishes to prolong? Let me return to the layperson because my thoughts are similar. Regarding Joe, I'd hazard a guess he also believes there exists innately predatory age gaps along with the vast majority of the population despite this making little sense with respect to definitions, and being easily as probable as the 'consent' and 'brain development' positions by making comparisons with customary activities—*playing football, taking them to bowling*—and inquiring about fundamental differences. From what I've said, it should be clear what I think a large portion of the reason for the defense of this absurd axiom is. *In the case of CSA victimologists I'd assume the reason leans towards moralism the most, which seems to exist in all cases of this.*

(The culture which continuously feeds into EDDD:

–Social Media

-Suler, J. (2004). "The online disinhibition effect."

-Waytz, A., & Schroeder, J. (2014): Overlooking Others: Dehumanisation by Commission and Omission.)

Before continuing I want to state I hold no animosity towards anyone against pedophilia, or anyone, for that matter. I'm sure most people who wish for the imprisonment of the real-life humans (who share the paraphilia my real-life human body has) are normal, kind inviduals whom I would have a pleasure engaging in conversation with, talking about matters with. It's not very difficult to look past online disinhibition. In regards to predator hunter videos, I don't necessarily care outside of the EDDD which isn't exclusive to that content.

In linking back to a focal point, the pervasiveness of EDDD, I ask, for for the first time, what is the fundamental difference between the mechanism of EDDD in regards to pedophilia and other subjects where its effects have been noticed? Regarding pedophilia, its infinitely more pronounced, however, I wonder about a **fundamental** difference. Keeping the individual's own conviction they're in the right constant *(irregardless of correctness)*—CSA is inherently harmful; gun ban = less gun violence; gay exposure is harmful to children—the processes are synonymous, in that even under these perceived dictums, high levels of overriding emotion, disparagement, dehumanisation and *demonisation* are utilised. Now, these are agreers; they know they're right. Is this simply passion about their beliefs? What are the epistemic justifications? I'm going to repeat myself: If a cause is truly cared about, why not scrutinise and scrutinise—a necessary process in searching for the best possible solution? I've already discussed and will continue to discuss the absurd, incredulous axioms concerning CSA, and so once again I'll make a comparison with the arguments for gun control: It's widely believed what was done in Australia and the United Kingdom in 1996 and 1997 is relevant to the current gun situation in the USA. There isn't any investigation regarding this position, not even an asking how the countries are comparable, let alone a questioning of causality claims based only on correlation *(who *isn't* normally sceptical towards causality claims?);* despite all this, it's believed they do have the best possible situation. And you have to ask why they don't investigate their position in the slightest. What is so enticing about the gun ban position that people firmly stand by it despite a clear lack of investigating and broad knowledge concerning the topic*?* By this time I've made my thoughts pretty clear.

Now, knowing this: How do you *know* that of all your positions, you stick by due to soundness and not what's enticing outside of that? In other words: How do you know you don't possess the same mentality of gun-ban partisans, but with regards to another subject? How do you know you're not the gay-pathologisers of today's childhood sexuality? How did the gay-pathologisers *know* they weren't the masturbation-pathologisers of then's homosexuality? Unrelated from everything I've been discussing—and I mean it - I'm simply curious—I'll give you this to think about. In 1973, with a NORC poll, it was first evidenced that the vast majority of Americans—70%—viewed homosexual relations as always wrong, *and I imagine this figure was higher in the 1950s.* Why do you think, from this period, the average American person held such absolute views regarding the *positive* claims about homosexuality despite presumably not investigating the position very far. Make a list in your head. What would be so enticing about such a position? Do you posit there are enticing aspects outside of religious devotion, or possible sex-control motives? What are they

On differing perspectives, I myself have incessantly imagined myself in the shoes of others, wondering if my divulging of this side of CSA research is perceived as no different than when loony conspiracy theorists divulge their 'truths' regarding 5G towers and flat earth, for which there are, I imagine, entire literatures rivalling those of unbiased CSA research's in terms of quantity and possible cohesiveness—and I wondered if my scoffing at their ridiculous concepts is no different than their scoffing at the idea CSA's link with maladjustment is overestimated. This is why, as of around May 2024, *with*

smidgens of this forming until before then, I now consider myself to have an open mind with regards to ideas, with the presence of EDDD acting as a sort of predictor for the ideas I think deserve the most immediate scepticism and subsequent scrutiny. This, of course, along with sexuality narratives, means biting the bullet and considering conspiracy theories like the Sandy Hoax or prospects such as the Islamification of Europe and whether or not that's a good or bad thing—taking these discussions and considering them as seriously as any other in existence. I feel that now I've traversed through infant necrophilia I can traverse through every topic. Of course I can be incorrect about things and feel insecure, inadequate, but that exists independently of the fact there is no blindfold of emotion or morals to prohibit me from civilly discussing topics—of all levels. At this time I've beaten them, the topics; it's only the people which can frustrate me now, though I am aware EDDD is never necessary, ever, and I know when to self-flagellate and contemplate. This means I've beaten the real-life human stage and am now a spectator. I also know I'd be insusceptible to past panics and hysterias, as this state I'm in is the antithesis of the state I'd consider vulnerable.

An intermediate jotted in July:
The giving/seeing of justice feels good; it satisfies intrinsic motivations Buckholtz, J. W., et al. (2008) Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (2002) Carlsmith, K. M., Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2008) Schmitt, M., et al. (2010), but there are times at which the barrier of humanisation is sanguinely, forcefully effaced in meeting this high in some moral disengagement—EDDD: euphemistic labelling, denying of HU, HN traits, social disconnection. Ultimately, this is a throbbing sore, and one throughout history: When you deny people worth, moral senses, humanness, social engagement, it becomes a lot easier to commit violence against them. This is a consistent factor in school bullying, bad marriages, family relationships, witch-hunts, homophobic prosecutions, and it is deeply intermingled with any and all causes of large-scale conflicts. Honestly, those self-aware should be capable of looking at the past, the evidence and see such cause-and-effect (violent, contemptuous actions following EDDD) as inherently negative regardless of how good it may be perceived in the moment. Warning: the docile party can contribute to this violence also, as once any disagreement is demonstrated to be unsolvable by honest discussion or compromise, what message is received other than "The language I understand most is violence"? Attacking "bad" people understandably is pleasurable, however, there's a heavy, dangerous conflation between bad with respect to a measurable harm-maker, and bad by virtue of being in opposition.

Just look at the Red scare, Lavender Scare, Satanic Panic, the whole homosexuality fiasco of 3/4th of the 20th century—all of which happened not even more than a century ago; we haven't collectively, suddenly overcome our propensity for this. I heavily point to the phenomena's crux being at human nature, an EDDD, as EDDD is with what these panics propagated. I reiterate, our civility and advancements are an illusion of some alleviation at this, of some overcoming. With respect to epistemological approaches acting as the most significant enders to these panics and pandemoniums, the issue has become covert and compounded, as we now adorn our social-intuitionism-birthed axioms with a better science and modalities, and fallaciously, automatically assign the conclusions as 'more likely to be true' in correlation with our 'better general' understandings of the world—*this is not how science works*. We aren't fundamentally different to anyone who's lived in the past hundreds of years: the gay-pathologizers, the exorciser Christians, the puritan townsfolk with pitchforks at mothers, with accusations of witchery, and bringing down calamity onto crops and teens and innocent children. "But I would never do tha-" the only way you'd know you wouldn't succumb to these panics is by recognising the human nature which would incline you to gleefully take part—that is the propensity to disparage, dehumanise, and demonise upon spates of emotion and desire for self-benefit. Grab ten intelligent babies whose paths in the modern age would be scholarly articles and veneration in scientific fields, plop them in 16th century Europe, and nine of them would be out hunting witches on lunch-breaks. We can't assume these natural inclinations disappeared when we became more technologically advanced; that makes zero sense.
It shouldn't be about breakthrough epistemological approaches to these dilemmas—*the Hooker study, for example*—as it really is about the person, the approaching of topics with a level head, rationality and healthy scepticism—the very antithesis of EDDD. I liken it to trying to move a half ton magnet up a steel stairway and having to set it down after each step. With breakthroughs, you merely force society and professionals to budge, then they return to latching on to their EDDD and biases. Look at the steps from masturbation, to homosexuality, to pedophilia. Some of the main contributors to the depathologisation of masturbation also had relaxed views towards homosexuality, viewing it as neither harmful, nor pathological—Havelock Ellis, Sigmund Freud; Alfred Kinsey Magnus Herschfeld—with those with positive contributions towards public understanding of homosexuality also having relaxed views towards pedophilia or childhood sexuality—Sigmund Freud Alfred Kinsey; John Money, Richard Green; Theo Sandfort, Vern Bullough. And virtually all current professionals and savants with nuanced, positive understandings of pedophilia, CSA and childhood sexuality also have nuanced, positive views towards homosexuality, so you'd have to wonder their roles had they been born earlier—as well as much, much earlier in linking back, as I've stated my perceived characteristics of someone who would not succumb easily to panics; they are the exemplars of that.

This emotion, disparagement, demonisation package with its dashes of dehumanisation does not have an anomalous good product *(pseudo-justice)*. It's as questionable as every other of its products: Gay-conversion Therapy; Mass-immigration; Postmodern feminism; Age of consent; Wars; Bullying; Domestic violence. Again, the flourishings of these ideas and happenings are considerably dependent on overriding emotions and a disparagement, or disparagement and potential demonisation of things, persons or a people. In order: Homosexuals; Native working class/patriots; Men; Sex; The other side; The victim; The spouse—Through multiple different mechanisms incorporated under the EDDD umbrella: Moral disengagement, denying HU, HN traits; FA error; online/mob disinhibition; smearing.
When someone is disparaged and demonised through this *heavily* emotion-logged process, the path opens to enacting upon them justice. Or pseudo-justice, if you will, which manifestly carries the same short-term self-benefits as rational justice.

* * *

The pervasiveness of this attitude. And pedophilia.

I posit injustice as a decider in an issue's perceived significance *Bondü, Holl, Trommler, Schmitt (2022).* Especially amongst those with higher JS, when injustice is believed to be involved, moral outrage *(or, *sigh*, empathetic and personal anger)* ensues, but so do more rational approaches—but not all moral outrage leads to rationality; the moderator of this is context. Again, we can look at justice. As aforementioned, it feels good to deliver, and witness, but in this regard, in the short term, there is no distinction between justice delivered at the end of rational and thorough approaches, and justice delivered at the end of sizzling emotions, outrage, disparagement and demonisation. I refer to this as some addiction, some crack cocaine given the simplicity, frequency at which it can be reached; it's infinitely more enticing than rational justice. The short-term effects are wonderful—the long term effects, not. People struggle, and will continue struggling to realise their propensity for this, and I use the extreme instance *(pedophilia)* as demonstration.

(I do recognise fervid emotion and rationality can co-exist. I don't doubt there exists fervid emotion about ideas or justices with rational bases.)

I'll bring this back to the political context I introduced with, and the one you're familiar with: As you've noticed, once moral superiority is claimed, those who disagree are morally wrong, malicious; you observe echo chambers, groupthinks, silos—interpersonal pleasures—and as is clear, there's very little incentive to cease from this ecstacy, this cocaine. Arising from this we observe positions about which the position holder's are passionate: college students—specifically ill-informed—in, or emerging from schools with as same passion, if not more, towards certain subjects than those holding rational, thought out perspectives. Passion, sorely mis-equated with inherent rightfulness, and goodness *(Steve Kurr: When r we gunner do something!).* And passion towards *perceived* injustices, which, in the absence of facing or understanding real-world issues *(sheltered: female; middle/upper class)* the natural draw to is powerful—this going off to *find* issues which appeal to emotions and grandstand potential *(vouching to home every refugee strokes my moral and emotional erection more than housing the homeless we currently have!).* And this is where ideas constructed with emotion, left unchecked, grow to purport, or appear to possess similar merit to those founded on rationality—*to the point they stand alongside, for a political example, national security, inflation, mass immigration as determiners in voting interest: "I will *only* vote for he who intervenes in the foreign conflict; only he who supports my transgenderism; only he who will let me abort; only he who is not 'racist;' (i might also slot in sectarian politics)*—what should purely be nuanced discussion has been heavily tarnished by people who's injustices are prematurely conceived on grounds of ignorance, emotion, and, again, the staying afloat of these ideas is dependent on deep-heated emotion, and a DDD of those who oppose it with smidgens of feel-good righteousness. *(This is a possible result of consistently conceding power to emotion throughout history; the absolute dregs of democracy, where national interest is ignored over personal),* and this mindset only compounds, as you can imagine, relatively, the opinions towards someone who doesn't share the value that any one of these thing should be held to the utmost level of regard: Scary, evil, worrying, dangerous, terrifying. When emotion becomes not only complementary to rationality, but on par, issues are left with the potential of appearing just as important or severe. The bombastic superficiality of it is enticing, naturally, and it is not only rewarded through pleasure—*subsequent, easy moral or justice orgasms*—but interpersonally, even, and with no glaring incentive to quit, how is it any less addicting than crack cocaine? Allow me to return to this: What people are perceiving as the greatest injustice is purely that which stokes their emotions and moral senses to the highest degree, and this is the mechanism by which a considerable number of injustices are perceived, and the mechanism by which all injustices *can* be perceived: How can a society who doesn't recognise this call themselves objectively right in delivering any justice at all? Do me a favour, and consider how culture shapes how we view things, emotionally. How do you *know* you are any different from a rageful third-world lynch mob gleefully killing a petty thief under the pretence of a rational justice? What is the incentive for them to stop? *Gleefully*. Why should they not vilify and denigrate all thieves to the highest level irregardless of the crime's context, and content? Hell, a petty thief. This is no different than the CSA panic. The flimsy axiom under which pedophilia is condemned is consciously built upon with so much bias, ignorance, misrepresentation and language abuse precisely to preserve pedophiles as the perfect punching bag for all sorts brutalisation and violence; perfect, in there's no moral question about it, which other victims of socially-engineered hatred face though to an infinitely lesser degree across all respects; the ists, the phobics. How is the attitude carried out by smearers, and pedophile condemners fundamentally different from the aforementioned mob savages? This is observed in vigilante videos—the extremes of this not caring about children over the satisfaction from a pseudo-justice. Society is no different. If society truly cared about CSA victims, they would at least consider, and investigate the relative literatures which contend the current trauma mechanism by which children are directly harmed; you would try something; you should hope the CSA narrative is wrong, you should rejoice at any possibility of scientific progression irregardless of any seeming impossibility—like a rabies cure; we know diseases can be cured, we know of psychological iatrogenesis, both seem impossible, yet possible so—but you don't, and these are ignored so everything I've accused you of can subsist. I say subsist because the axiom is flimsy, incredibly flimsy. If you take away the rations—the lies, distortion, misrepresentation—the man in the basement will starve. The man will not react, no actions against him will feel good.

The deep interweaving of EDDD and pseudo-justice within the innermost fibres of current pedophilia attitudes should start people a questioning of current positions, and subsequently less extreme instances involving the phenomenon. I reiterate, this is a thing which must be recognised and actively battled. You will notice the brains of many who profess rationality literally cease function when pedophilia, necrophilia, and neprophilia are mentioned; they lash out, emotionally, with tinges of hypocrisy and blindness, and these are the individuals to be terrified of; they are volatile, dangerous, horrifying;

they're incapable of realising when their actions equal those of frenzied apes and third-world 'barbarians'. With and under the semblance of better civility, morality and judgement, what is the limit to someone's actions? Do think—what is the limit here? God, just look at the USA's recent history with the middle-east. Look at the entire west. This is what I refer to, the pervasiveness I point to, a foundation of some intrinsic "betterness" and "righteousness" to fall back to, push forward with, even if the means of pushing involve EDDD and blatant irrationalities. Look at the timeline of interracial relationships, homosexuality, paraphilias today. Republicans speak of private firearms as the last line of defence against a tyrannical government. For the "sin" there is none—only preventative measures. The sin. The disparaging of things, the calling them a sickness, an illness, the shutting them down through EDDD: The inferior negroes, the sinning faggots, the psychopathic child-predators. It's a terrifying tool, defended to hell, preserved to hell. People were GLAD to have it utilised in the congressional condemnation of the Rind study. GOD. The real-life human children are SICK.

*I want to emphasise I AM *NOT* positing directly off social media; that would be extremely embarrassing and invalid; what I have done is considered its impact in the real world. The negative attitudes concerning pedophilia I refer to consistently stem from scientific professionals, the law; passerby lay people and politicians—as with the same concerns of EDDD or simple smearing against other groups.*

Morals. EDDD. Pseudo-justice. I first tried explaining why people behave like they do towards pedophilia and CSA, but I simply could not stop seeing the pervasiveness of the problem's root when it was first dug out; I did work backwards. I don't know—this is very slapdash. Nepiophilia. Infant necrophilia. Maybe I'm not offering any valid solution, in that I'm failing to work around the inevitable, emotional crying lash-outs. Maybe I'm wrong. I don't know. All I know in regards to my correctness is Plato talking about "pretended justice" which I only discovered following the completion of this essay, and Applewhite's ramblings. I don't care. Why do I care about the real-life human universe?
Pedophile hate-mobs. Third-world lynch mobs. Ignore everything and anything which will inhibit our building the bad or neutral guy as disproportionately more bad than he is, so we get a bigger moral and emotional orgasm when we attack him!!! *(Predator RAPES a child = hot teacher banged by 16-year-old (Pedophiles have reptillian brains, are psychopaths - Victim! Abuse! Horror! What! I don't care about more nuanced or differing perspectives! Don't impede on our sweet justice and moral righteousness!)* Maybe the patent parallels I've provided will help people fight the disease in their own way; I don't see how the two are fundamentally different. I never have. We aren't fundamentally different from them, or anyone that's lived in the past thousands of years. We only think that because we're civilised and "better" cultured. Parts of our cultures carelessly revolve around our human nature. Conservatives glare at porn yet cheer on the shooting deaths of two protestors. It's always human nature. It's always been there to address. Addiction. Addiction. I reiterate, I do not care about particular positions, ideas or intelligence. Let's pretend the countless literatures from which my position on CSA and pedophilia arose are wrong; there was still rationale behind my views. All I care about is rationality. God. If I were to fervently push pedophilia it would be meaningless due to the lack of good foundation to start widespread discussion. It's a tool to help people realise a latent propensity for EDDD; I'm also partly pissed at misinformation. If I was serious about pedophilia progression... then I believe starting with necrophilia would help build that foundation as there aren't any good arguments against it in and of itself. Extremely strict corpse brothels—those of sound mind, consenting and without friends or family, donating their bodies to the place. What would be the genuine pushback, really? God, the guys on Newgon are so moronic with their pedophile uprising and protest shit. "I'll only vote for the party most accepting of pedophiles!" "Nepiophilia is a line CROSSED!" You're all the same. You're stuck on the human stage.

-÷,×–-*_____*-–×,÷-

Bonus concerning pedophilia

My point ends, but I wish to tie this video up and discuss how EDDD may also adversely affect scepticism.
*We all know what the person worried about the Harehills councilor screaming Allahu Akbar is: Racist, Nazi, Fascist (because it's definitely not indicative of sectarian politics!); likewise, a person questioning the truthiness of a young boy being harmed by his sexual encounter with an older woman is typically met with rage—first and foremost—they're called a pedophile, predator, or both sympathiser, and they're shut down as a defender of 'rape' (the scientifically invalid type), even when the boy appears to be asymptomatic—and this outrage which shuts down scepticism isn't any different from the cancel-culture conservatives typically oppose. I'll quote from a reply I made, which regards hypocrisy, and how people might perceive the literature on a subject for the first time. I said the issue isn't they aren't accustomed with, or with *the* research papers. The issue is how scepticism (motivation) is, not only shut down, but attacked, after which healthy sceptics may retreat in preserving reputation, wellbeing, and their comfortable position of EDDD, moral superiority, and pseudo-justice the faulty axiom permits, realising it's not worth losing in their reward-driven minds.*
I'd assume a considerable number of men don't actually buy the misattribution or delayed trauma explanation for, say, when a 15 year old bangs his hot teacher, but given the extraordinary gaslighting and how batshit insane people go, I'm not surprised they don't defend it further than a snide or joke comment; I assume these are 'ephebophiles' who aren't affected by the outrage as much as to completely abandon the pleasure obtained from blah blah blah'ing pedophiles.

These should be the easiest grounds to start scepticism, but we're not seeing it on the scale of other, more, on first glance, esoteric ideas likely due to this—though this issue isn't exclusive to pedophilia, obviously, as it happens in every idea with a *PERFORMS COOL POSE* *"non-mainstream truth".*

-÷,×–-*_____*-–×,÷-

Help & Sources:

-ChatGPT for providing studies
-Researchgate for downloading studies
-library.lol for downloading studies

Endnotes:

*-If democracy *had* to remain, then only working class men, after a general political knowledge test, should vote. But EDDD extends past politics—I was only highlighting it's effects here.*
-I didn't know "transgenderism" was derogatory, in regards to my professional investigator 'friends'
-I'm not well versed in politics... I have a lot of questions to ask and a lot to learn but that is not important to me right now....

-I started this document on my main GA in early June,. Following the attempt on Donald J. Trump's life is a crucial time for the world to address this issue. I'm simply hoping something can change (not necessarily concerning pedophilia and CSA—which, with regards to science, I don't necessarily care for outside its use as the extreme instance of this issue)

September 7th: Everything I've done and said from August 2022 to May 2024 is deeply regretted. I've only become somewhat knowledgeable until recently, so, truthfully 75% of what I've said before May is going to be extremely vacuous, especially in regards to antinatalism and religion—I've made numerous errors on CSA, also. Currently, I wish I was more literate regarding certain subjects, I guess, considering how this pseudo-intellectual, vapid nonsense has already been forced onto me by the foundational mistake of grossly misplacing 'Nicholas Prosper' into the real-life human universe. To me it is unclear if this essay even makes sense; this essay comes from an irk 'I' feel, or some need to satisfy the revolting need to feel superior this body feels—knowing the truth!!!. In actual truth, this is irrelevant in the motor-inn or the spectator life (adjacent to the real-life human universe where we can know the aftermaths of the inconsequential happening) where Clementine can't be shot by bandits, and we laugh and glance at this earth and giggle because it's inconsequential. Elements of the real-life human universe are retained, as evidenced in the language she gave to me: "I will find you". How do you "find" in the "afterlife", (or the life I will return to), if it does not function similarly to this universe? I've beaten the real-life human stage. If Clementine, or some divine being disguised as Clementine wasn't leading me through this vocation, I would have failed a long time ago.